REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the office action dated October 2, 2006, in which the Examiner rejected all claims. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 13, 16, 22, 25 and 27 under § 102 as anticipated by a Chevron website; rejected claims 1, 7, 13, 15, 19, 21-22, 24-26, 28 and 30 under § 102 as anticipated by Garwood (US 4675177); rejected claims 2-3, 8-9, 14, 23, 29, 33, 40, 47, and 54 under § 103 as obvious over Garwood in combination with Richardson (US 6362136); rejected claims 5, 6, 17-18 and 20 as obvious over the Chevron website in combination with Richardson; rejected claim 10 as obvious over the Chevron website in combination with O'Rear (US 6627779); rejected claims 11-12 as obvious over the Chevron website in combination with Richardson and further in view of O'Rear; rejected claims 31-37 and 52-58 as obvious over Garwood in combination with Richardson and further in view of Ishida.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thoroughness of the examination and detailed arguments set out in the office action. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully traverse all of the rejections for the reasons set out below.

Applicants have amended the claims to recite a method for increasing the efficiency of hydraulic energy transmission in a hydraulic system. This recitation is supported in the original specification at paragraphs [0009] and [0134] and further supported by the data in Table 7. Applicants have made the surprising discovery that decreasing the density of certain oils in hydraulic systems can increase the relative efficiency of the system. At the time this invention was made, it was not known that decreasing density would have this effect, or even that it would have any effect at all.

For example, the website identified below teaches that the viscosity index, rather than the density, has an effect on system efficiency.

http://www.machinerylubrication.com/article_detail.asp?articleid=776&pagetitle=The%20Benef its%20of%20Maximum%20Efficiency%20Hydraulic%20Fluids

Response to Office Action dated October 2, 2006 Serial No. 10/781,028

None of the cited references teaches or suggests that lowering the density of the hydraulic

oil will result in improved system efficiency and it would not be obvious from the teachings of the

references that selection of lower density oils would have the claimed effect.

Thus, as presently claimed, the invention of increasing the efficiency of hydraulic energy

transmission in a hydraulic system is novel and non-obvious. Applicants respectfully request that

the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections and allow the claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all of the claims are in condition for

allowance and favorable consideration by the Examiner is requested. Should the Examiner find

any impediment to the prompt allowance of the claims that can be corrected by telephone

interview, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshiharu Baba et al.

P.O. Box 2463

Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By: /Marcella Watkins/

Attorney, Marcella Watkins Registration No. 36,962

(713) 241-1041

7